

**A STUDY OF CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS
FOR THE PREPARATION OF K-12 TEACHERS**

Elaine Chin and Roberta J. Herter
University Center for Teacher Education

California Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

Faculty Research Fellows Program
Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento

March 2000

This report was produced with the help of a 1998-99 contract from the California State University Faculty Research Fellows Program for the Center of California Studies. The opinions taken in this report do not necessarily reflect the opinion of the Center for California Studies or any of the other agencies that assisted the researchers in its production. The Faculty Research Fellows Program is under the direction of Professor Robert Wassmer, Center for California Studies, California State University, Sacramento. Information on the Faculty Research Fellows program and a list of all previous reports can be found at www.csus.edu/calst/completed_faculty_research_reports.html.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents **ii**

Executive Summary..... **iii**

Policy Recommendations **iv**

Introduction..... **1**

A Brief History of Alternative Teacher Credential Programs..... **2**

Characteristics of California Internship Programs..... **2**

Design of the Study and Data Collection Methods **6**

Analysis of University Internship Programs..... **7**

Issue 1: The Effects of Severe Teacher Shortages on University Internship Programs... **7**

 The Transformation of Traditional Teacher Education Programs **7**

 Changes in Faculty Roles and Responsibilities **9**

Issue 2: Changing Relationships between Universities and Local Schools..... **10**

Issue 3: Allocation of Resources **13**

 Conflicts in Remuneration Policies **13**

 Resources Required for Support Provider Training **14**

Issue 4: Accountability and the Quality of Program Information **15**

 Redesigning the Annual Census Form..... **16**

 The Need for Greater Structure and Guidance in Writing the Narrative Reports **16**

 Evaluating Program Outcomes: Tracking Interns' Post-Program Employment..... **17**

Acknowledgements **20**

References..... **21**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Alternative teacher credentialing is one response to the need for more and better qualified teachers. Alternative credentialing is considered to be an alternative because it breaks with certain traditional practices in teacher education, namely that candidates work full-time in schools as intern teachers while simultaneously acquiring the skills and knowledge needed. In alternative programs, there is no extended period of preteaching course work before candidates enter the schools as student teachers.

This report focuses on university-sponsored intern programs. University intern programs have prepared over 4000 teachers in the eight years the state has funded such efforts under Assembly Bill 1161. As the system that produces the most teachers in the state, we have chosen to focus our report on CSU internship programs.

This report addresses the issues raised by an examination of university intern programs' organization, their administration, the services provided, and the unique challenges each faces. We have chosen to organize this report around issues rather than programmatic features so as to highlight ways in which policy decisions may affect the future function and organization of these programs.

Issues discussed include the following:

1. The effects severe teacher shortages have had on university internship programs. Specifically, traditional teacher education programs are forced to incorporate internship programs into their structure to realize cost efficiencies and constraints imposed on faculty, staff, and facilities by additional program requirements.
2. Changing relationships between universities and local schools. University faculty involvement in new programs is constrained by requirements for teaching, service and scholarly activities in their existing positions. In addition, insufficient university faculty require school districts to play an expanded role in preservice teacher education, which sometimes conflicts with their primary responsibility, the instruction of K-12 pupils.
3. The inadequacy of resources allocated to alternative programs. Current levels of funding do not support the activities required of program directors, staff, or support providers to maintain high quality alternative teacher preparation. The emergence of other programs to address the professional development of teachers presents conflicting claims on experienced teachers. There is competition with these other programs for the services of the limited number of teachers available to play multiple roles in supporting weak or new teachers. More resources are needed for the retention and further training of Support Providers for the interns.
4. Limitation on program accountability because of existing forms and methods of program data collection. A redesign of major forms of data collection and greater specificity in data reported requires adequate funding by the state. In particular, resources need to be allocated to the development of a post-program employment tracking mechanism.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Alternative credentialing programs contribute significant numbers of teachers to the state of California. The following recommendations for policy decisions affecting the alternative credentialing of teachers fall into four categories: fiscal reform, program accountability, resource allocation, and improving instruction at all levels.

Program funds are administered by both school districts and universities and accounted for with inconsistent procedures. Accounting for program allocations, grants and fees should be done under standardized procedures. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) could provide guidelines for directors and participating districts in fund management and systematic accounting procedures. In addition to reconciling accounting procedures, program directors advised that their allocations were inadequate in order to provide support for interns or attract faculty to off-campus sites.

Alternative teacher credentialing (ATC) programs need systematic data collection and analysis for consistent program evaluation and accountability. A redesign of the current census forms would allow for a better evaluation of program outcomes. Directors' reports need to be more than anecdotal; however, the fact that their programs are often staffed by untenured or part-time faculty explains in part why there isn't more accurate and detailed information about candidates. The absence of hard data prevents tracking candidates' performances over the long term. Without data that tracks what happens to candidates in ATC programs, we don't know who stays in teaching and who leaves. We also don't know how many people on emergency permits are part of the revolving door. This information could be developed as part of a computerized exit profile that tracks teachers into the field and through their early careers. Without such information, programs lack the necessary data for evaluation and accountability.

Similarly, the state needs an overall, statewide picture of who is credentialing whom and in what ways. Further accountability measures are needed to know precisely how district intern programs and university teacher credentialing programs use their available resources. Sufficient funding is necessary in order to provide adequate data collection and accountability for programs. Current configurations of both intern programs and university teacher preparation programs do not provide for sufficient staff to monitor program progress nor to follow students in their early careers.

The preparation of teachers in ATC programs needs to provide equivalent support or more support for under prepared teachers. Internship is more intensive than conventional student teaching and requires more on-site supervision. More money is needed to train and keep high quality support providers when competition from BTSA might skim off the best of them. Standardizing remuneration given to teachers who act as mentors across all the programs requiring some type of support (interns, BTSA, PAR) will prevent further inequities between those already credentialed and those gaining their credentials through internship programs. Consequently, professional development at all levels, including faculty, is necessary to insure the adequacy of instruction at all levels. Finally, separate programs are being developed without adequate oversight of their creation, design and functioning to assure an integrated approach to improving the quality of teaching for new and weak teachers. The various programs can support each other and not compete against each other, further contributing to the fragmentation of resources and duplication of efforts.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher shortages in California are forcing schools of education and policy makers to rethink the ways in which teachers are being prepared for today's schools. Alternative teacher credentialing is one response to the need for more and better qualified teachers. Alternative credentialing is considered to be an alternative because it breaks with certain traditional practices in teacher education. In one alternative approach, intern programs, candidates work full-time in schools as intern teachers while simultaneously acquiring the skills and knowledge needed. In alternative programs, there is no extended period of pre-teaching course work before candidates enter the schools as student teachers.

The number of alternative teacher credentialing programs has increased because of growth in the numbers of people teaching on emergency permits. To obtain an emergency permit, a person merely needs to hold a bachelor's degree and pass a minimum skills test. By law, emergency permit holders must take at least 6 credit hours per year towards a teaching credential. The recent passage of the amendments to the Title 5 Regulations for Emergency Permits tightens the requirements for continuing employment. Emergency permit teachers are allowed to work for only four years on such a permit while maintaining satisfactory progress towards a credential. Thus, many school districts are encouraging their emergency permit holders to apply to the internship programs as one way to acquire state certification. However, emergency permit teachers must meet the standards for application and admission to the internship programs that are required of all internship applicants.

In addition, teaching has become an attractive profession for those seeking a second or third career. However, traditional teacher education programs often do not meet the needs of these teacher candidates. The extended time in school without pay creates financial hardships for these more mature candidates. Alternative programs allow second career candidates to be fully employed while seeking their credential.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ALTERNATIVE TEACHER CREDENTIAL PROGRAMS

Across the country states have shared a common concern for the quality of instruction; however, it is teacher shortages, especially in hard to staff areas, that have driven the authorizing of alternative certification programs in California, Texas and New Jersey (Cornett, 1990; Dill & Stafford, 1992; Dill, 1996; Feistritz, 1993; Stoddart & Floden, 1995). In addition, teaching has begun to attract workers from other careers paths including large numbers of military personnel displaced because of downsizing (Dill, Hayes, & Johnson, 1999; Keltner, 1994). In California the passage of the Hughes-Hart Education Reform Bill in 1983 addressed the needs of school districts, both urban and rural, to recruit teachers to jobs in hard-to-staff areas, and then prepare them for credentialing (Karge, Young, & Sandlin, 1992; McKibbin, 1998). Since that initiative, people wishing to become teachers have participated in a variety of alternative routes to the teaching credential in programs sponsored by universities, school districts, or both in jointly sponsored programs (Tierney & McKibbin, 1993).

Controversy surrounding the history of alternative teacher credential programs centers around conflicting approaches to preservice teacher preparation (Stoddart & Floden, 1995). On the one hand, teacher preparation has traditionally been a process of combining university classroom learning with limited field experience and supervised practice teaching under the guidance of a master teacher. Intern programs, on the other hand, place candidates in full-time classroom teaching jobs with on-going support. Traditional and alternative approaches have begun to blur their differences, however, as universities increase field experiences required for coursework, and directors of intern programs acknowledge the need for better preparation for support providers.

CHARACTERISTICS OF CALIFORNIA INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

Traditional teacher education programs are university-based. Typically, they provide candidates with courses in foundations and methods for teaching before candidates enter schools as a

student teacher. Student teaching is an extended period of supported apprenticeship in a K-12 classroom. The student teacher is supervised by university faculty and the experienced K-12 teacher in whose classroom the student teacher works. Alternative programs use an internship model. That is, candidates are exposed to methods for teaching and management in an intensive, compressed summer experience and then placed in a K-12 classroom as a full-time teacher with full responsibility. They spend the next two years taking coursework in evenings, weekends and summers to obtain the knowledge and skills required for certification in California. Support is provided in terms of school-site mentors who oversee and guide the interns' development. If satisfactory progress is made, the intern acquires a teaching credential at the end of the two years, and like their traditionally prepared counterparts, may then teach in any public K-12 classroom in which they earned their credential. Thus, the internship model of professional preparation differs from traditional programs in their methods of delivery, staffing, and organization of curriculum.

Both alternative and traditional programs must meet the same standards for professional preparation set by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). Those who enroll in university sponsored internship programs must be admitted to that university's credential program, and thus fulfill that university's admissions requirements. The demonstration of subject matter competency is what distinguishes internship programs from other alternative routes to certification because this competency must be shown prior to admission. In other words, people who participate in internship programs demonstrate a level of knowledge about their subject matter that is comparable to candidates in traditional teacher education programs. Subject matter competence can be demonstrated through completion of an approved set of university courses or by examination.

There are two major types of alternative programs: district internships and university intern programs. The differences between district and university intern programs are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Comparison of District Intern and University Intern Programs

Characteristics of Program	District Intern Programs	University Intern Programs
Leadership	Director – District employee	Director –University faculty
Staffing	Instructors – generally drawn from district employees	Instructors – typically a mix of full-time faculty and part-time instructors who may or may not be district employees
Curriculum	Meets CTC standards for professional preparation Variations in organization of content for courses Flexible course scheduling Classes held at school sites or district office	Meets CTC standards for professional preparation Courses are often the same ones taught within traditional program by university faculty Flexible course scheduling Classes held at university and at school sites
Supervision/Support	Site-based mentors and/or district supervisors	Site-based and university supervisors
Recruitment	Often recruited from emergency permit pool already working within the district. Also recruits from local community members and paraprofessionals working in local schools.	Mixture of emergency permit holders, applicants for the traditional programs who are redirected into the intern program, or those directed to the university by a district

District intern programs are sponsored by a county office of education or local school district whereas university intern programs are housed within a school or college of education at a university. University intern programs often co-exist or use some of the same resources provided for the traditional teacher education programs on their campuses. District intern programs establish their own methods for admitting, teaching, evaluating, and credentialing their candidates that meet current state requirements. There are also a few hybrid programs where districts and universities act as co-

sponsors, each contributing a particular set of resources. Table 1 presents a generalized model of the structure and function of district and university intern programs.

This report focuses on the university intern programs. Although district intern programs have played a significant role in increasing the numbers of teachers in high-need areas, much already has been written about these programs (see e.g., McKibbin, 1995; McKibbin, 1999; McKibbin, 1988; McKibbin, 1998; Oliver & McKibbin, 1985; Wright, McKibbin, & Walton, 1987). University intern programs have prepared over 4000 teachers in the eight years since the state has funded such efforts under Assembly Bill 1161. This report addresses the issues raised by an examination of university intern programs' organization, their administration, the services provided, and the unique challenges each faces. We have chosen to organize this report around issues rather than programmatic features so as to highlight ways in which policy decisions may affect the future function and organization of these programs.

Currently, there are intern programs for elementary, secondary school and special education teachers. For this report, we have chosen to examine only those programs that prepare elementary and secondary teachers. Because of recent changes in state credential requirements for special education, an evaluation of these programs would not adequately represent what they currently do to meet the new credentialing requirements.

Since 1993, there have been 30 university intern programs. The number of programs has continued to increase with each funding cycle. Both private and public universities have participated in the intern grant program. The majority of interns in university intern programs, however, have been prepared by the California State University system. Therefore, we have chosen to focus this study on the CSU sponsored programs because the largest number and variety of communities and schools are likely to be affected by these programs.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY AND DATA COLLECTION METHODS

A representative sample of the CSU intern programs was selected from the total population. Care was taken to ensure that programs serving rural as well as urban areas were included in the sample. In addition, we included programs from each region of the state. Table 2 summarizes the numbers of interns enrolled and teaching during the 1998-2000 academic years at each site. However, because the internship is a two-year program, this number does not represent the number of interns who have necessarily completed the programs during that period. That is, the numbers of interns represented in Table 2 are those currently finishing the program, recently enrolled, or who did complete the program during 1998-99.

Table 2

Sample of University Internship Programs

Program	Region of California	Regional Characteristics	Number of Interns	Credential Types
A	North	Urban	15	SS
B	Central	Rural	63	MS, MS CLAD, MS BCLAD
C	South	Urban	300	MS, SS
D	South	Suburban	44	MS, SS
E	North	Urban	61	MS CLAD, MS BCLAD
F	South	Urban	154	MS CLAD, MS BCLAD
G	North	Rural	44	MS, SS
H	South	Urban	54	MS CLAD, MS BCLAD

Two major methods were used to examine the structure and function of the CSU university intern programs: an examination of program documents and interviews with the program directors. The program documents reviewed included the annual census of students submitted to the CCTC, the proposal for funding of the internship program, annual narrative summary reports submitted to the

CCTC, summary budget reports for 1998-99, and web-based materials for those programs who displayed program information on-line. A standard interview format was used with each director. Questions asked focused on the history, staffing and administration of the program. We queried directors about strategies used for recruitment and profiles of candidates. Directors were encouraged to speak at length about particular challenges their programs faced in light of increased demands for interns because of class size reduction. Finally, considerable attention was paid to the allocation of state and institutional resources used to support each program. Results from the analyses of the program materials and interview data are summarized in the following section.

ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

Issue 1: The Effects of Severe Teacher Shortages on University Internship Programs

The Transformation of Traditional Teacher Education Programs

People who succeed in internship programs are typically more mature, experienced, and self-reliant than candidates in traditional programs (Stoddart & Floden, 1995). Internship programs are recommended for these types of candidates because it is assumed that their relative maturity and greater life experience equip them for the challenges of teaching in classrooms without the extended support provided by student teaching. Some advocates and supporters of internship programs have been careful to point out that internship programs may not be for everyone seeking to become a teacher (Dill et al., 1999). In fact, students entering a credential program right out of college are probably best served by a traditional program.

University internship programs typically draw from one of three populations: (a) emergency permit teachers already employed by a district who are seeking a credential, (b) paraprofessionals or other types of district employees, parent volunteers, and community members employed in another profession who want to become teachers in their local schools, or (c) students currently enrolled in a traditional program who have not yet completed all the requirements for a preliminary credential.

The first two types of individuals are usually encouraged by the district to seek an internship credential through a local university. Students who are hired while still enrolled in traditional programs represent a small, but growing proportion of the internship population. However, in urban areas or hard-to-staff rural areas, the numbers of students abandoning traditional programs for the internship options have increased dramatically. Most campuses in these areas state that they have very few candidates left in the traditional program. For example, in one urban campus, the director of the internship program stated that less than 15% of their credential candidates are students in a traditional program. The director from a rural campus reported a fourfold increase in intern candidates within the last four years. Much of that increase can be accounted for by the transfer of students from the traditional full-time or part-time program to the internship program.

Candidates who might otherwise benefit from and complete a traditional program are lured by the prospect of full employment in a district. In their minds, the attractions of full pay and benefits may offset any drawbacks that full responsibility for a classroom may entail. While this practice of transferring candidates from traditional programs to internship programs may provide new teachers who are better supported, it does not eliminate the problem that the K-12 pupils are still being taught by under-prepared teachers who may lack the life experience and maturity of their second-career counterparts.

Universities have responded to the increased number of internship candidates and the concomitant decrease of traditional teacher education candidates by folding the internship programs into their traditional programs. The same instructors teach their courses to both internship and traditional students. Five of the eight programs did provide their interns with courses in the summer. However, only two of the eight required intern candidates to enroll in an intensive summer course that is specifically designed to help interns begin full-time teaching in the fall under limited supervision. The summer course helps prepare them for the challenges of teaching and managing a class on their own. One of the programs required interns to have completed either subject specific

methods courses or courses in management and instruction prior to beginning their internship, but these are courses normally offered within the traditional programs. The other campuses offered courses during evenings, weekends, and summer sessions to enable interns maximum flexibility in fulfilling course requirements. However, these courses are the same as those within the traditional programs.

The sharing of resources across both programs makes sense given the cost efficiencies realized in a joint operation. Funding for the internship program is set at \$1500/intern, an amount considerably less than what it costs to run any complex program or for that matter to educate any teacher within California's public universities. Thus, funding for the internship programs is heavily underwritten by state funds already allocated for traditional teacher education programs and resources provided by the districts themselves. (Funding and resource allocation is discussed in more detail in a later section of this report.)

Changes in Faculty Roles and Responsibilities

Differences in work load and responsibilities for faculty involved in internship programs is often masked by the similarities to the tasks required in traditional programs. Course teaching looks much the same in both programs, except in those cases where faculty have designed courses specifically for intern candidates. However, supervision of interns differs from that for student teachers in three specific ways: (1) frequency of contact, (2) type of support, and (3) changes in the nature of feedback given to interns because of the responsibilities they have for their K-12 pupils' learning. Because interns are on their own in a classroom, they require greater support by university supervisors and their on-site mentor teacher (also known as a Support Provider). Instead of a visit every two or three weeks that is required for student teachers, university supervisors may visit an intern on a weekly basis. In addition, supervisors are expected to help interns align their practices to each district's particular philosophy and performance expectations as well as to the new state standards for the teaching profession. These state and district-specific standards and expectations are

used by administrators to evaluate the intern's performance throughout the two-year program. Thus, this supervision takes place under high stakes conditions.

Faculty who assume the roles as directors of programs often do so with little or no release from their usual duties. In two of the programs, administrators in the colleges of education have taken on the additional responsibility of running the internship programs. One of these administrators also acts as a support provider for an intern in his program. Directors of programs are challenged to do much with very few resources. For example, one full-time faculty member and internship director spent much of the first year meeting with local school officials interested in hiring interns for their districts. Each relationship between the university and an individual school district requires the negotiation of a specific contract with that district. Programs that serve a large number of districts or a large geographical area are particularly challenged in their ability to negotiate and maintain these relationships. Moreover, school district participation varies from year to year. Thus, relationships between universities and local schools need to be constantly updated and renewed with changes in personnel or district policies.

Issue 2: Changing Relationships between Universities and Local Schools

Traditional teacher education programs are often accused of being disconnected from the local schools that their programs should serve. Internship programs require that a different set of relationships be forged between university faculty and district employees. The differences can be summarized in the following ways:

- (1) district and university faculty must work more closely together in providing instruction and support for the interns.
- (2) the nature of these collaborations often requires a fundamental shift in status between university faculty and district teachers and administrators. They need to work as co-equals in a variety of tasks that are traditionally controlled by one institution but not the other.

- (3) the workload for faculty often involves travel to off-campus sites with classes conducted in schools and site-based supervision requiring extensive off-campus commitments.
- (4) funds supporting intern programs are commingled with district funds, complicating accurate accounting procedures when attempting to identify actual costs of credentialing candidates.

Program directors uniformly report that supervision and support are provided by district employees. In addition, the university hires district employees to teach courses when university faculty are not available. This casts district employees, ranging from teaching staff to assistant superintendents, in the role of adjunct faculty with the additional responsibility of university teaching. The shortage of willing and available university faculty for off-campus teaching requires that district employees take on these additional tasks. District employees, often already stretched with intensive workloads, are called upon to take on yet another responsibility as support providers for newly hired interns. Despite compensation for their time and expertise, this drain on district employees challenges the adequacy of support available for the newest teachers.

Similarly, university faculty resist committing time to travel for off-campus teaching and supervision. The time intensive requirements of scholarship complicate the commitment of faculty to travel for teaching off campus. In the case of one university intern program, contractual agreements were made with sixty-two school districts. Supervision of one or two interns per district required the program director to hire support providers at each district, securing both shared supervision and funding for interns throughout a large geographical area. The commitments to collaboration between school districts and universities require a wide range of institutional support in order for faculty and district employees to meet their primary responsibilities and participate in alternative credentialing programs.

Changing roles also include the shared responsibility for teaching. Collaboration and negotiation characterize many of the interactions between university program directors and school district personnel. Again, time for planning on site courses is a requirement when faculty and district

personnel work together in teaching courses. The lack of funding to provide sufficient time for collaboration can be compensated for by leadership within programs. Directors who act in an administrative capacity on their campuses have a greater awareness of the problems with budget management and the constraints on personnel because of their direct responsibility for money in other arenas. This added awareness of budget issues allows directors with budgetary know-how more flexibility in planning and negotiating responsibilities within their programs on campus and with school districts.

The school districts with few interns have different relationships with universities and can be the source of more difficult budgetary negotiations. High-needs districts with many interns are more accommodating and expect more flexibility and support from the universities in preparing their teachers. In contrast, when the school district has a teaching candidate from the local community in mind, they turn to the intern program for support in getting the candidate subject matter competent in order to hire them as a teacher. The new hire then assumes dual roles, one as a new teacher, and one as a university student enrolling in coursework to support on-the-job learning. With university faculty team teaching courses on site with school personnel, interns have an opportunity to see theory and practice merge in their own teaching. The benefit of collaboration in support of the intern teachers was uniformly applauded by program directors, even while they acknowledge the strategic complications and funding problems they experience in administering programs.

Relationships between universities and school districts are complicated because of the commingling of grant monies with other funding sources for university and district programs. For example, six of the eight program directors reported problems in accounting that arose when districts were in conflict with universities over the control of accounting procedures. Some of the programs elected to have districts handle all accounting procedures while others subcontracted with the districts and used the university foundation offices for account management. Two directors reported

particular problems reconciling the various coding procedures required by the CCTC, their university foundation offices, and the school districts.

Issue 3: Allocation of Resources

University internship programs are partially supported by funds provided by the CCTC through their Alternative Certification Local Assistance Grants program. Each internship program receives funding at the level of \$1500 per intern enrolled in their program. Wide variation exists among the various programs in how each chooses to spend these funds. Many of the programs spend the bulk of the money in paying instructors for courses not typically offered through the traditional teacher education program that are taught by district employees or in providing stipends to Support Providers for each intern. Some campuses choose to distribute some of the funds to the interns themselves by paying for course books and materials or for summer course tuition. The remainder of the grant funds not allocated to instructors, support providers or interns is used to provide for the training of Support Providers. The need for greater accountability has resulted in a change in next year's grant proposal requirements; programs will need to allocate a small percentage of their budget to program evaluation, particularly methods for tracking candidates into their first year of employment upon completing the credential.

Conflicts in Remuneration Policies

Variations in funding allocation present specific problems for university internship programs. In remunerating Support Providers, each program must decide how much is adequate compensation. Factors that determine amount of remuneration include the number of interns supported by an individual support provider, the experience of the intern (a first or second year intern), the cost of living in an area where teachers may be forced for financial reasons to take on other employment, and/or competition from other programs that provide pay for support services, such as the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA). Generally, programs

provide more money to teachers supporting first-year interns as they need more time and intensive mentoring than second-year interns. Additional money is provided when Support Providers work with more than one intern; but to ensure high quality support, program directors ensure that no provider supervises more than two interns at any given time. However, the compensation is increased by only a fraction rather than doubled when a Support Provider takes on an additional intern. Other professions would be unlikely to see a fractional increase in pay as adequate compensation for double the work.

University internship programs also face competition from other reform efforts that depend upon and remunerate experienced teachers for their service to the profession. In particular, BTSA attracts highly qualified teachers as mentors for fully credentialed new teachers. They do so by providing extensive training in supervision of new teachers --training that these teachers see as opportunities for professional development, release time for training and work with novice teachers, and stipends for participation in the program. Often the teachers tapped for BTSA are the same ones desired by internship programs. The advent of the Peer Assistance and Review Program (PAR) will put additional strains on districts to find skilled teachers who can work as consulting teachers for tenured teachers needing to improve their performance. Both BTSA and PAR are being funded at much higher levels than the internship programs. Even though some of the funding from BTSA can be used for alternative teacher preparation programs, districts will be unlikely to redirect BTSA funds to such efforts given the large numbers of first and second year, fully credentialed teachers who will need to be supported by BTSA.

Resources Required for Program Staff Training

All of the program directors reported that the quality of their internship programs heavily depended upon the quality of the support providers. Despite the considerable expertise of individual support providers, programs need to provide training in strategies for supervision and assessment of interns. Training ensures that support providers align their supervision with the universities'

curricula and requirements as well as to the new state standards for the teaching profession. Moreover, directors use training opportunities as incentives for support providers to continue working with the programs. At these meetings, support providers were publicly recognized for their efforts and acknowledged for their expert practical knowledge. In lieu of compensation, which all directors acknowledged was inadequate for the level of support desired or required, support providers were given nonmonetary rewards. For example, one director described hosting a tea party to reunite district support providers at the end of the academic year. Another director tried to ensure that training took place in a pleasant environment and that support providers had easy access to free parking. Normal expenses incurred by any business in employing outside consultants are seen as a "perk" for internship staff and a way to stretch a limited amount of funds.

District employees who act as support providers are not the only ones in need of training in supervision and the implementation of new state teaching standards. Faculty at each of the universities offering internship programs were also not always knowledgeable about the requirements of these new standards. Three of the program directors identified the need for university faculty training to ensure better articulation of efforts between universities and local schools. However, such training efforts have been limited in part because few funds have been allocated for these purposes; it is often assumed that faculty are fully up-to-date about new forms of supervision and assessment.

Issue 4: Accountability and the Quality of Program Information

Currently, two forms of information are gathered about the internship programs. Directors submit an end-of-year census that reports on the demographics of program participants, the numbers of credentials earned, and recruitment sources, and the types of classrooms served by interns. In addition, directors write a narrative summary that highlights program strengths and challenges for that year. From these reports, adjustments are made by the CCTC to the budgets of each program if they are under or over the targets stated in their original grant proposals. The expansion of each

intern program as well as the increase in state funding makes issues of program accountability particularly pressing. While the existing information provides a broad brush view of each program's achievements and shortcomings, these data are not adequate for more in-depth program review or evaluation. There are three areas in which a redesign of data collection procedures may provide each program director as well as the CCTC with a more complex picture of program function: (a) the redesign of the existing census form, (b) a more comprehensive reporting of all facets of program functioning in the directors' narratives, and (c) standardized procedures and instruments to track candidates as they exit the program and begin employment as fully credentialed teachers.

Redesigning the Annual Census Form

The current census form requires directors to provide information about characteristics of the group of interns as a whole. For example, directors are asked to report counts on individuals by ethnicity, gender, and previous work experience. These reports summarize the numbers of interns teaching in various classrooms and subject matters and the numbers completing the credential within a particular funding cycle. Statistics are reported by single categories only. While these are useful broad categories, the current form does not allow an analysis that can link categories of information. The linking of categories would allow directors of the projects to ascertain, for example, how many male elementary school teachers are prepared through their programs, or to determine how many people with military or engineering experience are prepared to teach math or science, two severe shortage areas. Nor does it help directors identify which type of previous work experiences may lead people to choose to earn a credential in special education. Answers to these types of questions might help directors better direct their efforts at recruiting individuals from specific groups for certification when these groups are underrepresented in the teaching population. They would also allow policy makers to make more strategic decisions about the allocation of resources by program type, location, or credentials granted to meet severe shortages in particular areas of the state.

The Need for Greater Structure and Guidance in Writing the Narrative Reports

Narrative reports are, by their very nature, the least standard form of data provided by program directors. They should be flexible enough to allow each director to address the specific problems, challenges and strengths his or her program faces while also providing the CCTC with a comprehensive look that addresses standard features across all programs. Currently, directors are asked to describe the general features of their programs, the strengths, challenges and lessons learned during the previous year. However, comparisons of effective and ineffective practices across all programs are difficult to draw, especially in terms of program features that many directors have identified as of particular interest (e.g., approaches to training and retaining support providers). Three of the directors expressed a desire to get more information from other directors about effective practices, information that might well be gleaned from the narrative reports and shared among all program directors.

By specifying more clearly particular features of program functions that should be described in the narratives, the CCTC might acquire a more accurate picture of how well the allocation of funds within projects and across programs can affect program operations. The CCTC might also consider how the narratives can be used to represent the perspectives of other program staff and of the interns themselves.

Evaluating Program Outcomes: Tracking Interns' Post-Program Employment

The success of any program can be measured by its ability to fulfill its goals -- in this case, the preparation and retention of teachers for schools suffering from severe shortages of qualified, credentialed staff. However, current program practices do not allow directors or the CCTC to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs along these dimensions. At present, there is no instrument nor mechanism for tracking the post-program employment of internship graduates. Other than anecdotal evidence gathered by directors who have kept in touch with satisfied graduates, little is known about the employment or retention of graduates of the internship programs. This is true despite the fact that the California Department of Education compiles statistics about school staffing

in its demographics unit. Unfortunately, the state has chosen not to track individual teachers through this system so as to avoid violating the privacy rights of individuals. Thus, there is no way to ascertain whether an individual from any particular type of preparation program is more or less likely to be employed in a specific school or district.

Such policies tie the hands of policy makers who may need this information to make decisions about current and future increases in funding. Furthermore, it prevents policy makers from evaluating whether the program has improved the instruction of K-12 pupils, the ultimate test of the success of any teacher preparation program.

Future efforts at data collection and program evaluation may want to consider ways of linking tracking mechanisms to web-based technologies. We see this use of the web as a viable means to acquire data about individuals that is currently collected through more cumbersome means.

The recommendations for improved accountability, however, cannot be followed if there is not a significant increase in the amount of funding of the internship programs. Many of the suggestions for improving data collection require more staff and release time for project directors than is supported by current levels of funding. For example, the limited amount of information required for the census and the narrative can be traced to constraints on directors' time in gathering and reporting more complex forms of data. Very few of the directors we interviewed had adequate clerical staff or support to do the record keeping needed for extensive data collection. So much of their time is already occupied with the daily operation of the programs and negotiations with local school districts that additional requirements for data collection would be futile without additional support to do so.

The CCTC staff who oversee and direct the entire internship project are also underfunded and need additional support. Even if directors could gather better and more specific information about their programs and its outcomes, the analysis of such quantities of data would stretch the capabilities of a staff already working without adequate support. If the state requires accountability

for its programs, it must ensure that evaluation is linked to a resource base that can support it.

Otherwise, the state can only guess at the impact its programs have had in reforming the preparation of teachers and the instruction of K-12 pupils.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this report could not have been accomplished without the guidance and support of Dr. Michael McKibbin, a consultant for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing who coordinates the district and university internship programs in California. We wish to thank other members of the Commission staff who helped us identify relevant program documents and provided a forum for us to meet with other program directors. In addition, our understanding of the complexities of the university internship programs was greatly enhanced by the insights that the eight program directors shared with us in extensive phone interviews.

REFERENCES

- Cornett, L. M. (1990). Alternative certification: State policies in the SREB states. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67(3), 55-83.
- Dill, V., & Stafford, D. (1992). The alternate route: Texas finds success. *Educational Leadership*, 50(1), 73-74.
- Dill, V. S. (1996). Alternative teacher certification. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education : A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (2nd ed., pp. 932-960). New York: Macmillan.
- Dill, V. S., Hayes, M. J., & Johnson, D. S. (1999). Finding teachers with mature life experiences. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 12-15.
- Feistritzer, C. E. (1993). National Overview of Alternative Teacher Certification. *Education and Urban Society*, 26(1), 18-28.
- Karge, B. D., Young, B. L., & Sandlin, R. A. (1992). Teaching internships: Are they a viable route to California alternative certification? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 19(3), 9-18.
- Keltner, D. P. (1994). Troops to Teachers: Alternative certification and the military. *Educational Forum*, 58(2), 182-186.
- McKibbin, M. D. (1995). A decade of alternative certification programs in California . San Diego, CA: Fifth Annual Conference of the National Alternative Certification Association.
- McKibbin, M. D. (1999). *Report on the distribution of teaching internship grant funds for 1999-2000; Preliminary report on use of grant funds in 1998-99 and proposal for the use of carry-over funds* (Technical Report): California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- McKibbin, M. D. (1988). Alternative certification in California. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 15(3), 49-59.
- McKibbin, M. D. (1998). *Voices and views: Perspectives on California's teaching internship programs* (Technical Report): California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
- Oliver, B., & McKibbin, M. (1985). Teacher trainees: Alternative credentialing in California. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 20-23.

Stoddart, T., & Floden, R. E. (1995). *Traditional and Alternative Routes to Teacher Certification: Issues, Assumptions, and Misconceptions Issue Paper 95-2* (Position paper): National Center for Research on Teacher Learning East Lansing MI.

Tierney, D. S., & McKibbin, M. (1993). Strengths and Weaknesses in California Teacher Education Programs: A Four-Year Review. *Action in Teacher Education*, 15(3), 61-70.

Wright, D. P., McKibbin, M., & Walton, P. (1987). *The effectiveness of the Teacher Trainee Program: An alternate route into teaching in California* . Sacramento: California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.